

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Jerald C. Seelig et al.

Serial number: 10/757,613

Filed: January 13, 2004

Title: ROBOT INDICATOR FOR GAMING DEVICES

Attorney docket number: 619.739 ACC.CIP-Robot Indicator

Group Number: 3714

Examiner: Corbett B. Coburn

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE – INTERVIEW SUMMARY

In response to the office action mailed on July 28, 2006, Applicants respond as follows:

Petition for Extension of Time

A petition for a 3-month extension of time is enclosed along with a credit card payment form for the required fee.

Interview Summary

On October 19, 2006, Examiner Coburn and Applicants' attorney conducted an examiner interview. Applicants and Applicants' attorney thank the Examiner for his time and attention to this matter during the interview.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 C.F.R. 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

☐ **MAILING**
Deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ **FACSIMILE**
Transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Fax No.: _____

Signature

Name

Date

During the interview the outstanding office action was discussed, including the Reliance (Fey) reference. Applicants' attorney argued Reliance does not disclose an animated figure as defined by the claims and the specification. Examiner Coburn agreed to withdraw the section 102 rejection based on Reliance. Examiner Coburn said that he would check with his supervisor
5 and issue a formal withdrawal of the rejection, probably through a supplemental office action.

To date, Applicants' attorney has not received a supplemental office action or an interview summary. On November 21, 2006 Applicants' attorney sent an email to Examiner Coburn inquiring as to the status of the supplemental office action and interview summary.

Applicants' attorney has not received a response to that email. On December 19, 2006

10 Applicants' attorney called Examiner Coburn and left a message regarding the interview and that he had not received a supplemental office action or interview summary. Again on January 26 2007 Applicants' attorney left a similar phone message. Applicants' attorney has not received responses to either of these phone messages.

15 **Status of Office Action**

Based on the interview with Examiner Coburn, applicants' attorney believes that the section 102 rejection has been withdrawn. Since claim 1, an independent claim, was only rejected by this rejection, claim 1 appears to be currently allowed or at least not rejected. Since claim 1 appears to be currently allowed or not rejected, then each of its dependent claims must be
20 allowed or not rejected. Applicants cannot develop a response to any rejections until the status of the office action is clarified.

Office Action Error

The Office Action appears to contain an error. Claim 22 was elected by Applicants on February 8, 2006 along with claims 1-21. However, the Office Action does not address claim 22. Applicants request clarification as to the status of claim 22.

5

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, the applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the examiner has any questions regarding the application or this response, the examiner is encouraged to call the applicant's attorney, Ian Burns, at (775) 826-6160.

10

Respectfully submitted,

15

/ian f burns/

Ian F. Burns, Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration Number: 33,297